

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

TATYANA V. DERMOTT,

Plaintiff,

vs.

**Civil Action 2:14-cv-291
Judge Smith
Magistrate Judge King**

**PATRICK R. DONAHOE,
et al.,**

Defendants.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

This case was filed on March 28, 2014. Doc. No. 1. It does not appear that service of process has been completed on any defendant. On July 29, 2014, plaintiff was ordered to show cause why the action should not be dismissed. *Order*, Doc. No. 2. There has been no response to that order.

Accordingly, it is **RECOMMENDED** that this action be **DISMISSED**, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m), for failure to effect timely service of process.

If any party seeks review by the District Judge of this *Report and Recommendation*, that party may, within fourteen (14) days, file and serve on all parties objections to the *Report and Recommendation*, specifically designating this *Report and Recommendation*, and the part thereof in question, as well as the basis for objection thereto. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Response to objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy

thereof. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

The parties are specifically advised that failure to object to the *Report and Recommendation* will result in a waiver of the right to *de novo* review by the District Judge and of the right to appeal the decision of the District Court adopting the *Report and Recommendation*. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Smith v. Detroit Fed'n of Teachers, Local 231 etc.*, 829 F.2d 1370 (6th Cir. 1987); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).

August 6, 2014

s/Norah McCann King

Norah McCann King
United States Magistrate Judge